

FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS TITLE 21. PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION 1. DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES CHAPTER 1. OFFICE OF THE STATE ARCHITECT

SUBCHAPTER 2.5 VOLUNTARY CERTIFIED ACCESS SPECIALIST PROGRAM

Chapter 872, Statutes of 2003 (Senate Bill 262) calls for the State Architect to establish and publicize a new Voluntary Access Specialist Certification Program, requiring the publication of comprehensive regulations as a new subchapter under Chapter 1, *Office of the State Architect*, of Division 1, *California Code of Regulations*, Title 21, *Public Works*.

This regulation will establish the procedure to be followed by the State Architect for implementation of the Voluntary Certified Access Specialist Program.

The proposed regulation as originally noticed to the public clearly outlines the requirements a candidate has to meet for certification, recertification, and also enforcement of disciplinary measures after certification. However, in response to comments from the public, the Division of the State Architect has made the following changes to the regulation.

Article 1 – General Provisions

Section 113. CASp Scope of Work

The term “authorized agent” has been changed to “authorized requesting party”. Also current regulations are only applicable to new construction as stated by the commenter. Regulations applicable to existing construction are those in effect at the time of construction. The proposed revised regulation recognizes this distinction. Therefore, the reference to ‘current’ as originally appearing on the regulation is deleted. A CASp who is other than a design professional may only observe, report and/or defer to others; their observations and findings, and has no authority to certify a building or facility as compliant with state and federal laws, codes and regulations.

Section 114. CASp Scope of Work Limited To Design Professionals

The title of this Section may have been viewed as confusing as to its intent by those not licensed as Design professionals and therefore the regulation has been clarified as to its intent, therefore the words “CASp Scope of...” are deleted.

The language of the text in this section has been modified to indicate that architects and other design professionals are able to perform the services specified in Section 113, CASp Scope of Work, under the purview of their license or registration. The Certified Access Specialist (CASp) certification is only issued to those who have achieved a passing score on the CASp examination and complete fifteen (15) Continuing Education Units (CEU’s) during each subsequent three year period of certification. The modified text in this section now clearly defines the services of a “design professional” as it relates to services specific to those with a CASp certification.

The modified text in this section now clearly defines the services of a “design professional” as it relates to services specific to those with a CASp certification.

Article 2 – Definitions

Section 121 “Access Specialist” has been modified by inserting “Certified” before Access Specialist, indicating that the term “Certified Access Specialist” is limited to and indicative of an individual whose name appears on the Division of the State Architect’s current list of Certified Access Specialists.

Article 3 – Certification Process

Section 132. Criminal Convictions

Proposed text of this section has been modified to substitute “shall” for “may”

Section 133. Education and Experience

The term “qualifying experience” is clarified in this section . This is to establish that the applicant has a minimum of knowledge, skills and abilities with which to be eligible to take the CASp examination. The term “disabled community” will be changed to “disability community”.

Section 134. Candidate Examination

The term “exam courses” is not used in the regulation text. This section identifies areas of study for which Certified Access Specialists will be required to demonstrate their knowledge, skills and abilities.

Section 136. Certification Renewal

The State Architect has determined that in lieu of a recertification examination, the completion of fifteen(15) Continuing Education Units (CEU’s) of approved classes in Federal and State access regulation updates, and Universal Design, during the tri-annual period of certification will qualify a certificate holder for recertification.

Article 4 – Fees

Section 141. Fees

A review of the proposed fees has resulted in an adjustment of fees as follows:

Application Fee: \$500

Examination Fee: \$800

Certification Fee: \$300

Tri-annual CEU Verification and Certification Renewal Fee: \$500.00

This is the minimum level of fees necessary to support the program operating costs, given the projected level of participation. If more people apply to be certified, the fees may be able to be lowered in the future.

Article 5 – Enforcement

Section 151(a)3. Grounds for Certification Suspension, or Denial of Certification Renewal

Reference to “Industry Standards” has been deleted from this section. DSA will determine the factual correctness of submitted complaints.

SUMMARY AND RESPONSE TO COMMMETS RECEIVED DURING THE INITIAL NOTICE PERIOD OF MAY 29, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 8, 2007.

James D. Maletic, Commenter No. 1 provided via public comment form

Response to Commenter No.1

Support Comment: No response necessary.

Scott E. Woody, Commenter No. 2. Comments provided via public comment form

Response to Comment No. 2.01

Accepted: A review of the proposed fees has resulted in an adjustment of fees as follows:

Application Fee: \$500

Examination fee: \$800

Certification fee: \$300

Tri-annual CEU Verification and Certification Renewal Fee: \$500.00.

This is the minimum level of fees necessary to support the program operating costs, given the projected level of participation. If more people apply to be certified, the fees may be able to be lowered in the future.

Arnie Pike, Commenter No. 3. Comments provided from transcript of public hearing held on July 13, 2007

Response to Comment No. 3.01

Accepted: The language of the text in Section 114 has been modified to indicate that architects and other design professionals are able to perform the services specified in Section 113, CASp Scope of Work, under the purview of their license or registration. The Certified Access Specialist (CASp) certification is only issued to those who have achieved a passing score on the CASp examination and complete fifteen (15) Continuing Education Units (CEU's) during each subsequent three year period of certification.

Christopher Lawrence, Commenter No. 4 Comments provided via public comment form

Response to Commenter No. 4

Support Comment: No response necessary.

Kim Blackseth, Commenter No. 5, Comments provided via letter

Response to Commenter No. 5

Accepted: Reference to "industry standards," has been deleted from Section 151.(a) 3 of the regulations.

DSA will determine the factual correctness of submitted complaints.

Laura E. Williams, Commenter No. 6 Comments provided via email and from transcript of public hearing held on July 13, 2007

Response to Commenter No. 6

Accepted: A public hearing was held July 13, 2007.

Ruthee Goldkorn, Commenter No. 7 Comments provided via Email and from transcript of public hearing held on July 13, 2007

Response to Commenter No. 7

Accepted: A public hearing was held July 13, 2007.

Lisa Williams, Commenter No. 8 Comments provided via public comment form

Response to Commenter No 8.

Support Comment: No response necessary.

Lila Levinsen, Commenter No. 9. Comments provided via public comment form

Response to Comment 9.01

Accepted: See Response to Comment No. 2.01.

Response to Comment 9.02

Accepted: The State Architect has determined that in lieu of a recertification examination, the completion of fifteen (15) Continuing Education Units (CEU's) of approved classes in Federal and State access regulation updates, and Universal Design, during the tri-annual period of certification will qualify a certificate holder for recertification.

Douglas Stead, Commenter No. 10 Comments provided via public comment form

Response to Comment 10.01

Rejected: The use of the language proposed by the commenter would limit others within the design community from qualifying to take the CASp examination.

Paul Morgan, Commenter No. 11. Comments provided via public comment form

Response to Comment No. 11.01

Accepted: See Response to Comment No. 2.01.

James Brogan, Commenter No. 12 Comments provided via public comment form

Response to Comment No. 12.01

Accepted: See Response to Comment No. 2.01.

Francie Moeller, Commenter No. 13. Comments provided via email

Response to Comment No. 13.01

Rejected: It is necessary to restate the purpose of the program as described in the statute at the beginning of the proposed regulations.

Response to Comment No. 13.02

Rejected: The authority is specific to Government Code (GC) 4459.5 which directs The State Architect to establish a program for voluntary certification of any person who meets specified criteria and testing to determine competency as a certified access specialist.

Francie Moeller, Commenter No. 13. (Continued)

Response to Comment No. 13.03

Rejected: The statute requires the State Architect to "establish... a program for voluntary certification". This regulation clarifies that a certified access specialist (CAsp) may observe, report and defer to others, their observations and findings.

Response to Comment No. 13.04

Accepted: The title of Section 114 may have been viewed as confusing as to its intent by those not licensed as Design Professionals and, therefore, the regulation has been clarified as to its intent.

Response to Comment No. 13.05.(a)

Accepted: The modified text in Section 114 now clearly defines the services of a "design professional" as it relates to services specific to those with a CAsp certification.

Response to Comment No. 13.05.(b)

Accepted: The term "exam courses" is not used in the regulation text. Section 134 of the regulations identifies areas of study for which Certified Access Specialists will be required to demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and abilities.

Response to Comment No. 13.05.(c)

Accepted: The term "generally accepted industry standards" has been deleted from Section 151 of the regulations.

Response to Comment No. 13.05.(d)

Accepted: The term "qualifying experience" is clarified in Section 133. This to establish that the applicant has a minimum of knowledge, skills, and abilities with which to be eligible to take the CAsp examination.

Response to Comment No. 13.06

Rejected: Completion of the application is necessary to determine that the applicant meets the minimum qualifications necessary to be able to take the CAsp examination.

Response to Comment No. 13.07

Accepted: Proposed text of Section 132 has been modified to substitute "shall" for "may".

Response to Comment No. 13.08(a)

Rejected: Experience gained as a plan reviewer, building official or inspector for a local jurisdiction provides experience in the application of the access elements of the CBC.

Response to Comment No. 13.08(b)

Rejected: There are no courses specifically required by statute. Section 133 establishes the minimum education and experience necessary to take the CAsp examination.

Response to Comment No. 13.09

Rejected: The examination content is based upon standards governing access to buildings for persons with disabilities, including those referenced in Section 134.

Response to Comment No. 13.10

Rejected: The State Architect entered into a contract with Cooperative Personnel Services dba. CPS Human Resource Services to develop and validate the Certified Access specialist examination. The examination is based on the professional standards identified in Section 135. The passing score necessary for certification will not be determined until after the administration and validation of the first examination.

Response to Comment No. 13.11

Accepted: See Response to Comment No. 9.02.

Francie Moeller, Commenter No. 13. (Continued)

Response to Comment No. 13.12

Accepted: See Response to Comment No. 2.01.

Response to Comment No. 13.13

Rejected: The Statute provides the State Architect with the authority to suspend certification or deny certification renewal, subject to receipt and review of factual complaints.

Response to Comment No. 13.14, (a)

Pursuant to the statute, an Ad Hoc Advisory Committee was established to assist in developing the Certified Access Specialist Program.

Response to Comment No. 13.14, (b)

Rejected: The statute provides the State Architect the authority to perform periodic audits of work performed by certified access specialists as deemed necessary to ensure the work performed is factually correct.

Response to Comment No. 13.15

Rejected: The successful completion of the Certified Access Specialist examination and the completion of 15 Continuing Education Units (CEU's) during each three year period of certification is verification that the CASp has met the minimum level of competency established by the State Architect with which to perform the services of a CASp.

Colleen Boyer, Commenter No. 14 Comments provided via public comment form

Response to Commenter No. 14

Support Comment: No response necessary.

Judi Nishimine, Commenter No. 15 Comments provided via public comment form

Response to Commenter No. 15

Support Comment: No response necessary.

Francesca Krauel, Commenter No. 16 Comments provided via public comment form

Response to Commenter No. 16

Support Comment: No response necessary.

Gloria Sharkey, Commenter No. 17 Comments provided via public comment form

Response to Commenter No. 17

Support Comment: No response necessary.

Dale Monday Kolins, Commenter No. 18 Comments provided via public comment form

Response to Commenter No. 18

Support Comment: No response necessary.

Betty D. Hyde, Commenter No. 19 Comments provided via public comment form

Response to Commenter No. 19

Support Comment: No response necessary.

Kathleen M. Zbacnik, Commenter No. 20 Comments provided via public comment form

Response to Commenter No. 20

Support Comment: No response necessary.

Suzanne M. Ward, Commenter No. 21 Comments provided via public comment form

Response to Commenter No. 21

Support Comment: No response necessary.

Jaean Kezeor, Commenter No. 22 Comments provided via public comment form

Response to Commenter No. 22

Support Comment: No response necessary.

Donna Galvin, Commenter No. 23 Comments provided via public comment form

Response to Commenter No. 23

Support Comment: No response necessary.

Lloyd Princeton, Commenter No. 24 Comments provided via public comment form

Response to Commenter No. 24

Support Comment: No response necessary.

Mimi Roth, Commenter No. 25 Comments provided via public comment form

Response to Commenter No. 25

Support Comment: No response necessary.

Robert Woods, Commenter No. 26. Comments provided via email

Response to Comment No. 26.01

Accepted: See Response to Comment No. 2.01.

Response to Comment No. 26.02

Rejected: It is not necessary to change the regulation text because building officials are already eligible based on their work experience and/or education.

Ellen Cantor, Commenter No. 27 Comments provided via public comment form

Response to Commenter #27

Support Comment: No response necessary.

Jürgen Dostert, Commenter No. 28. Comments provided via comment form

Response to Comment No. 28.01

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 3.01.

Response to Comment No. 28.02

Accepted: A CASp who is other than a design professional may only observe, report and/or defer to others their observations and findings, and has no authority to certify a building or facility as compliant with state and federal laws, codes and regulations.

Bertha Hernandez, Commenter No. 29 Comments provided via public comment form

Response to Commenter No. 29

Support Comment: No response necessary.

Jonathan Adler, Commenter No. 30. Comments provided via comment form

Response to Comment No. 30.01(a)

Accepted: The term “authorized agent” per your comment has been changed to “authorized requesting party”.

Response to Comment No. 30.01(b)

Accepted: The reference to “current” has been deleted from Section 113 of the regulations.

Response to Comment No. 30.02

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 28.01.

Douglas R. McCauley, Commenter No. 31. Comments provided via letter

Response to Comment No. 31.01

Accepted: See Response to Comment No. 3.01 and text modifications to Section 114.

Gil de la Pena, Commenter No. 32 Comments provided via letter

Response to Commenter No. 32

Support Comment: No response necessary.

Judy Halberg, Commenter No. 33 Comments provided via email

Response to Commenter No. 33

Support Comment: No response necessary.

HolLynn D’Lil, Commenter No. 34. Comments provided via email

Response to Comment No. 34.01(a)

Rejected: The State Architect is directed by Government Code 4450 (c) to adopt codes and regulations for accessibility that are equal to or greater than those in Federal Law.

HolLynn D’Lil, Commenter No. 34. (Continued)

Response to Comment No. 34.01(b)

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 28.01. It is for the owner and/or “authorized requesting party” to determine the manner in which to respond to the readily achievable regulations of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Response to Comment No. 34.02

Accepted: See Response to Comment No. 30.01(b). Current regulations are only applicable to new construction as stated by the commenter. Regulations applicable to existing construction are those in effect at the time of construction. The proposed regulations have been modified to recognize this distinction.

Response to Comment No. 34.03

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 34.01(a). These regulations are necessitated by the enactment of a California statute and, as such, all references to “state” are California specific.

Response to Comment No. 34.04

Accepted: “Access Specialist” has been modified by inserting “Certified” before Access Specialist, indicating that the term “Certified Access Specialist” is limited to and indicative of an individual whose name appears on the Division of State Architects’ current list of Certified Access Specialists.

Response to Comment No. 34.05

Rejected: CASp is an Acronym for Certified Access Specialist.

Response to Comment No. 34.06

Rejected: Based on a review of prior court rulings, certification programs that include an examination are considered equivalent to a licensure program.

Response to Comment No. 34.07

Rejected: See Response to Comment No.34.01(a) and Response to Comment No. 28.01.

Response to Comment No. 34.08(a)

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 13.13 and Response to Comment No. 34.06.

Response to Comment No. 34.08(b)

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 13.14(b).

Response to Comment No. 34.08(c)

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 13.13.

Response to Comment No. 34.08(d)

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 34.06.

Mary Ann Aguayo, Commenter No. 35. Comments provided via letter

Response to Comment No. 35.01

Accepted: See Response to Comment No. 3.01.

James P. Corn, Commenter No. 36. Comments provided via letter

Response to Comment No. 36.01.

Rejected: Accessibility standards found in Section 1121 B of the 2007 California Building Code, are specific to transportation facilities.

Response to Comment No. 36.02.

Rejected: Government Code 4459.5 establishes the Certified Access Specialist program (CAsp) Government Code 4454 (b) requires California Department of Transportation engineers to achieve certification within 180 days of the establishment of the Certified Access Specialist Program to assure their conformance with the Title 24 of California Building Code, including Section 1121 B Transportation Facilities, and the ADA.

Response to Comment No. 36.03.

Rejected: The Statute requires that the certification be valid for a three (3) year period and, further, that renewal applicants be subject to a reassessment of their qualifications.

Response to Comment No. 36.04.

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 36.02 and Response to Comment No. 9.02.

Response to Comment No. 36.05.

Accepted: See Response to Comment No. 9.02.

Response to Comment No. 36.06

Rejected: It is not necessary to change the regulation text because engineers are already eligible based on their work experience as are those not yet licensed as engineers.

Response to Comment No. 36.07.

Accepted: See Response to Comment No. 2.01.

Timothy L. Craggs, Commenter No. 37. Comments provided via comment form and attached written form

Response to Comment No. 37.01.

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 36.01. Additionally, the CAsp certification validates that the individual has demonstrated an acceptable level of knowledge of standards governing access to buildings for persons with disabilities. This knowledge is inclusive of transportation facilities.

Joseph Partansky, Commenter No. 38. Comments provided via comment form and attached written form

Response to Comment No. 38.01.

Rejected: This is a certification program, the proposed language exceeds the scope of the program as established by the State Architect. The workload proposed by the comment would exceed the resources available to support the program.

Response to Comment No. 38.02.

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 38.01.

Joseph Partansky, Commenter No. 38. (Continued)

Response to Comment No. 38.03

Accepted: The text of Section 113 has been modified. See Response to Comment No. 30.01.

Response to Comment No. 38.04

Rejected: The current regulation statement, “performed in the specified area of disability access rights,” recognizes the variety of tasks that might be performed in order to be eligible to take the CASp examination.

Response to Comment No. 38.05

Rejected: Language of regulation is to remain as shown.

Sharon Toji Commenter No. 39. Comments provided via email

Response to Comment No. 39.01

Rejected: Statute requires the creation of a certification program that requires an applicant to demonstrate competency with regards to accessibility laws, regulations, and codes.

Response to Comment No. 39.02

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 39.01

Response to Comment No. 39.03

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 39.01.

Response to Comment No. 39.04

Rejected: See Response to Comment: No. 39.01.

Peter Margen, Commenter No. 40. Comments provided via comment form and attached written form

Response to Comment No. 40.01

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 34.01(a).

Response to Comment No. 40.02

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 34.01(a).

Response to Comment No. 40.03

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 34.01(a) and Response to Comment No. 28.01.

Response to Comment No. 40.04

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 34.01(a).

Response to Comment No. 40.05

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 34.06.

Response to Comment No. 40.06

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 34.06.

Peter Margen, Commenter No. 40. (Continued)

Response to Comment No. 40.07

Rejected: The statute provides the State Architect the authority to determine the minimum criteria a person is required to meet in order to take the Certified Access Specialist examination.

Response to Comment No. 40.08A

Rejected: The State requires the State Architect to create a Certified Access Specialist Program. The proposed regulation requires applicants to self-certify that they do not have prior criminal convictions, as specified.

Response to Comment No. 40.08B

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 5.

Response to Comment No. 40.09

Comment Received: No Response necessary.

Richard Skaff Commenter No. 41. Comments provided via comment form and email

Response to Comment No. 41.01

Rejected: The statute requires the State Architect to establish a voluntary Certified Access Specialist program.

Response to Comment No. 41.02

Comment received: No response necessary.

Response to Comment No. 41.03

Rejected: See Response to Comments No 28.01(b), 34.01(a) & 34.01(b).

Response to Comment No. 41.04(a)

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 34.02.

Response to Comment No. 41.04(b)

Rejected: Contents of the examination are confidential. Section 134 of the regulations identifies the areas of knowledge to be covered by the examination.

Response to Comment No. 41.05

Rejected: See Response to Comment 34.01(a).

Response to Comment No. 41.06

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 34.04.

Response to Comment No. 41.07

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 34.06.

Response to Comment No. 41.08

Rejected: See Response to Comment No.34.01(a) and Response to Comment No. 28.01.

Response to Comment No. 41.09

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 13.13 and Response to Comment No. 34.06.

Richard Skaff Commenter No. 41. (Continued)

Response to Comment No. 41.10

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 34.08(b). Complaint review and processing will be conducted by staff of the CASp program. The enabling statute authorizes a fee to support program operation costs.

Response to Comment No. 41.11

Rejected: Statute allows the State Architect to conduct audits of the work performed by Certified Access Specialists. The enforcement provisions are necessary to support this responsibility utilizing the fees authorized by the enabling statute. See Comment No. 34.06.

Judy Henn, Commenter No. 42

Response to Commenter No. 42

Support Comment: No response necessary.

Mark Smith Commenter No. 43. Comments from transcript of public hearing held on July 13, 2007

Response to Comment No. 43.01

Accepted. See Response to Comment No. 2.01

Response to Comment No. 43.02

Rejected: Per statute, upon receipt and verification of the factual accuracy of a written compliant, the State Architect may determine to suspend or deny a certificate or deny renewal of a certificate. GC Section 4459.5 requires the State Architect to establish and publicize a voluntary certified access compliance specialist program.

Response to Comment No. 43.03

Accepted: See Response to Comment No. 5

Response to Comment No. 43.04

Rejected: Rejected: The Legislature by enacting Government Code 4459.5 granted the State Architect the authority to establish parameters for the CASp program.

Response to Comment No. 43.05

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 5.

Teresa Favuzzi Commenter No. 44. Comments from transcript of public hearing held on July 13, 2007

Response to Comment No. 44.01

Accepted: See Response to Comment No. 30.01A.

Response to Comment No. 44.02

Accepted: "disabled community" will be changed to "disability community"

Response to Comment No. 44.03

Accepted: See Response to Comment No. 2.01. The fee structure as revised, is necessary to support the projected operating costs for the CASp program.

Jon Lonberg Commenter No. 45. Comments from transcript of public hearing held on July 13, 2007

Response to Comment No. 45.01

Accepted: See Response to Comment No. 2.01.

Response to Comment No. 45.02

Rejected: State Architect finds the final regulations are compliant with the content of GC Section 4459.5 to 4459.9.

Response to Comment No. 45.03

Accepted: Consideration of extending a nominal two (2) year CASp certification to the Subject Matter Experts (SME's) that assisted in the development of the CASp examination is under consideration by the State Architect.

Ben Rockwell Commenter No. 46. Comments from transcript of public hearing held on July 13, 2007

Response to Comment No. 46.01

Accepted: See Response to Comment No. 2.01.

Response to Comment No. 46.02

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 28.02.

Laura Williams Commenter No. 47. Comments from transcript of public hearing held on July 13, 2007

Response to Comment No. 47.01

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 41.11.

Response to Comment No. 47.02

Accepted: See Response to Comment No. 2.01.

Response to Comment No. 47.03

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 13.09.

Response to Comment No. 47.04

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 47.03.

Ruthie Goldkorn Commenter No. 48. Comments from transcript of public hearing held on July 13, 2007

Response to Comment No. 48.01

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 13.03. This is not an enforcement program

Response to Comment No. 48.02(b)

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 13.09.

Response to Comment No. 48.02(c)

Rejected: See Response to Comment No. 5.

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE PERIOD THE MODIFIED TEXT WAS AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC.

The modified text was made available to the public from November 29, 2007 through December 14, 2007. The Division of the State Architect did not receive any comments on the modified text.

ALTERNATIVES DETERMINATION

The State Architect has determined that no alternative would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the regulation is proposed or would be as effective as and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed regulation.

[Pursuant to Government Code section 11346.9(a)(5), if anyone proposes an alternative that would lessen the adverse economic impact on small businesses, the final statement of reasons must include an explanation setting forth the State Architect's reasons for rejecting any proposed alternatives.]

LOCAL MANDATE DETERMINATION

The proposed regulations do not impose any mandate on local agencies or school districts.